(1-3 set)

(3)

(1)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 3826 /2004

PETITIONERS:-

1) Vijay Singh Chandel
S/O- Late Ram Balak Singh
Aged about 44 years
Assistant Sub-Inspector
Dantewada, Distt- Dantewada
(Chhattisgarh)

2) Ramesh Kumar Pandey
S/O- Ram mani Prasad Yadav
Aged about 44 years
Assistant Sub-Inspector
Dantewada, Distt- Dantewada
(Chhattisgarh)

3) Ram Avtar Patel
S/O- Raj Bhan Patel
Aged about 43 years
Assistant Sub-Inspector
Dantewada, Distt- Dantewada
(Chhattisgarh)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS:-

1) Union of India
Through- The Secretary
Ministry of Personnel
Public Grievances Depot
New Delhi

2) State of Chhattisgarh
Through- the Secretary
Home Department (Police)
D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

3) State of Madhya Pradesh
Through- The Secretary
Home (Police) Department
Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)

4) The Director General of Police
Chhattisgarh Raipur (C.G.)

5) The Director General of Police
Madhya Pradesh Bhopal (M.P.)

WRIT PETITIONER UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

XI-HC-78

(23)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

**मामला क्रमांक** ..... W.P.3826/ ..... **सन् 200** 4

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

| आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक | हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश | कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश |
|---|---|---|
| | 4-5-2005<br>On a mention being made, the matter is taken up for hearing.<br>Mr. Virendra Sharma, counsel for the petitioners.<br>Mr. Raghavendra Pradhan, Standing Counsel for Union of India/ respondent No.1<br>Mr. G.K. Beriwal, Deputy Advocate General for the State of Chhattisgarh/respondents No.2 & 4.<br>Heard.<br>The petitioners, who are working as Assistant Sub-Inspectors in the Police Department presently posted at District: Dantewada, have moved this writ petition under Article 226/ 227 of the Constitution of India. Their case is that after re-organization of the State, the petitioners gave their option for the State of Madhya Pradesh as they are permanent residents of the State of Madhya Pradesh, and the respondents ought to have allocated their services to the State of Madhya Pradesh, but so far no order has been passed, their allocation is not decided, and they are working in the State of Chhattisgarh only.<br>In the circumstances, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners may be allowed to make a representation to respondent No.1 through respondents No.2 & 3 for allocation of their services to the State of Madhya Pradesh, to which learned counsel appearing for respondents No.1, 2 & 4 have no objection. | |

(24)

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

**मामला क्रमांक** ..... W.P.3826/ **सन् 2004**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

| आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक | हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश -2- | कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश |
|---|---|---|
| | Having heard learned counsel for the parties, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and looking to the limited request made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners are allowed to make a representation to respondent No.1 ~~within one month from today~~ through respondents No.2 & 3. In the first instance, the petitioners should make their representation to respondent No.2 within one month from today, in turn, respondent No.2 after receipt of the same shall forward it to respondent No.3 with its comments within three months from the date of receipt of the representation, and in turn, respondent No.3 again shall forward the same to respondent No.1 with its comments within another three months thereof, and ultimately, respondent No.1 after considering the recommendations of respondents No.2 & 3 and the request of the petitioners should pass appropriate order within another three months thereof, in accordance with law.<br>With the directions aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.<br>In view of this order, M.(W.)P.No.4236/2004 and I.A. No.553/2005 also stand disposed of.<br>Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.<br>**Sd/-**<br>**L.C.Bhadoo**<br>**Judge** | |
| Soma | | |